

*Oral Questions*REASON PAKISTAN EXEMPTED FROM DEADLINE FOR  
RENEGOTIATION OF NUCLEAR SAFEGUARD AGREEMENT

**Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Given that the government undertook in 1974, at the time it introduced its new safeguard proposals, to renegotiate within one, and now two, years all safeguard agreements with countries receiving Canadian nuclear supplies, can the minister explain why Pakistan was exempted from this deadline for the agreement on upgraded safeguards?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, Pakistan has not been exempted from the decision of the government to secure upgraded safeguards. However, the deadline has been extended because of a number of factors, particularly the question of Pakistan wishing to be considered in tandem with India. Pakistan was not prepared to enter into an upgraded safeguards agreement until our decision with respect to India had been taken. That decision having been taken, we are presently proposing a new series of negotiations with Pakistan this month, I believe including, we hope, an upgraded safeguards agreement with that country.

**Miss MacDonald:** In view of the fact that this is beginning to look more and more like a two nuclear policy, and in view of the obvious reluctance of Pakistan to upgrade their nuclear safeguards agreements, can the minister say how long Canada is prepared to continue supplying nuclear material to Pakistan without having obtained an upgraded agreement?

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** As long as there is a buck in it.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, we are presently providing materials to Pakistan under previously arranged agreements. At the present time Pakistan has not been in default of any agreement it had previously concluded with Canada. That ought to be made very clear. What we are seeking is an upgrading of agreements with Pakistan. The hon. lady should not insinuate in her question that in some way Pakistan has been in default. It may be that the stringent proposals we will put before Pakistan will prove to be too onerous for that government, and at that point we will have to consider what we will do by way of further co-operation with Pakistan.

POSITION OF PAKISTAN ON NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION  
AGREEMENT

**Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands):** A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It is more than four months since the Prime Minister stated in this House that he could not give the House any assurance that Pakistan would change its position on the NPT, can the minister report now if in the current negotiations with Pakistan they have indicated any willingness to change their position with regard to the NPT?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** I would say no, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Lang.]

## AIR TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF MINISTER'S STATEMENT ON  
BILINGUAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL IN QUEBEC

**Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. I should like to ask whether his statements in conversation with CFCF were correctly reported this morning in the *Montreal Gazette* in the headline "Both Languages in Quebec air space by 1978". If so, can the minister explain what purpose he foresees for the commission or whether he was merely summarizing the obvious, as there are already six airports in Quebec offering the two languages?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, the remarks and the report have to be put in the context of what our intentions are in relation to the volume of air traffic serviced in Quebec, assuming that we can indeed establish certified, secure procedures which assure safety. The conversation, in other words, related to the fact that at all times we recognize the need to certify procedures as safe before moving toward the implementation of the actual procedures. Of course, a lot of work has been done on that in our own ordinary departmental office and also with the commission. The conversation would continue with the question: assuming that that all works favourably and you get the procedures which are assured as safe, then what is the timetable? That is when I indicated that our timetable had been for progressive implementation throughout the province of Quebec through to the end of 1978. That is not a guaranteed time because there are implementation questions that arise as it moves forward but that is the target and that is the way it was described.

POSITION OF FRANCOPHONE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS ON  
CO-OPERATION WITH COMMISSION ON BILINGUAL AIR  
TRAFFIC CONTROL

**Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the minister for that explanation. I think it is most important that it be clarified. I should also like to ask whether the minister has had any indication of a change of attitude on the part of Les Gens de l'Air who to my latest knowledge made no suggestion whatsoever that they were prepared to co-operate with the commission. I think it is highly desirable that they should.

● (1430)

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, some of the discussions we have been having with Les Gens de l'Air have been for assuring that co-operation with the commission. This is quite apart from the necessary involvement of Les Gens de l'Air with the simulator exercises and other activities. We have been making progress in that regard, but the discussions will no doubt be continued.

NEW AIR NAVIGATION ORDER ON USE OF LANGUAGE—  
GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Transport to do with the memorandum of agreement among the